



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,801	05/30/2001	John W. Cherwonogrodzky	BJS-3929-3	5677
23117 7590 12/19/2006 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			EXAMINER FORD, VANESSA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		12/19/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/866,801

Applicant(s)

CHERWONOGRODZKY, JOHN W.

Examiner

Vanessa L. Ford

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 63-65 and 67-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 63-65 and 67-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendments and responses filed September 25, 2006. Claims 63 and 78-79 has been amended. Claims 81-96 have been added.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Rejections Withdrawn

3. In view of Applicant's amendment and remarks the following rejections are withdrawn:

- a) rejection of claims 63-65 and 67-80 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph (New Matter), page 3, paragraph 3 of the previous Office action.
- b) rejection of claims 63-65 and 67-80 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, page 9, paragraph 6.

Rejection Maintained

4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (written description) is maintained for claims 63-65 and 67- 80 and newly submitted claims 81-96 for the reasons set forth on pages 4-8, paragraph 4 of the previous Office Action.

The rejection was on the grounds that the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

Art Unit: 1645

way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to an antigenic composition for detecting anti-aflatoxin antibodies from a sample of a test subject said composition comprising a fungal or yeast cell culture supernatant containing fungal or yeast components shed into the supernatant during culturing; said antigenic composition being characterized by a reduction of antigenic activity similar to a control sample and at most by 20% as measured by ELISA after treatment with protease in 0.25M TRIS buffer at pH 7.2.

To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus. This, description would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention. What kind of fungal or yeast components are these? Do these fungal or yeast components have specific characteristics or properties?

The instant specification has not adequately described the claimed antigenic compositions. It is unclear as to what components are contained in the claimed compositions.

The instant specification discloses culture supernatant antigens were prepared and test antigen sensitivities were evaluated for DNase, RNase or protease (page 8). The specification discloses that the culture antigens were tested using Male CD1 mice (page 9). The specification refers to the test antigen as "killed fungal or yeast cellular material" (page 9). What constitutes the "fungal or yeast cellular material"? The instant specification does not disclose that aflatoxins are contained in the claimed compositions. The specification merely discloses that aflatoxins were purchased and used as controls (page 9).

To adequately describe the genus of antigenic compositions, one skilled in the art must describe components that are contained in the compositions. The specification has not provided written description for the claimed compositions. A description of what components used to formulate the composition might reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, "[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, 'does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed' ". The courts have decided: The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed. See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement

Art Unit: 1645

provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. *The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1*, "Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of compositions, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The Guidelines further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus. Therefore, absent a detailed and particular description of a representative number, or at least a substantial number of the members of the genus of compositions, the skilled artisan could not immediately recognize or distinguish members of the claimed antigenic compositions. In view of the above, the instant specification fails to meet the written description requirement as set forth under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant urges that the antigenic components of the composition are fungal or yeast cell supernatants. Applicant urges that the claimed compositions are presented in the form of a product described by the process by which they are produced. Applicant urges that the dependent claims contain a mixture of antigens which are capable of binding to different fungal or yeast species.

Art Unit: 1645

Applicant urges that product-by-process claims are proper when the Applicant is otherwise unable to define his product other than by the process employed to produce it. Applicant urges that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the Application was filed.

Applicant urges that one of ordinary skill in the art is well aware what constitutes fungal or yeast cellular material.

Applicant urges that the specification provides at page 19 evidence to support their conclusion that some culture supernatants such as *Alternaria*, *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* are far better than the use of purified aflatoxin for detecting anti-aflatoxin antibodies.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is the Examiner position that Applicant has not adequately described their invention and therefore has not satisfied the requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph. Applicant asserts the one of ordinary skill would know what constitutes fungal or yeast cellular material. Applicant has not adequately described what components are present and/or not present in the claimed antigenic composition. Applicant asserts that the product is claimed by the process by which the product is produced. Applicant asserts that the antigenic compositions of the claimed invention

Art Unit: 1645

are novel and not found in the prior art because of the process by which the product is produced. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim. Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover,

Art Unit: 1645

since the claims broadly encompass antigenic compositions, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The Guidelines further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus.

Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Based on Applicant's disclosure and what is known in the art, the skilled artisan would not conclude that Applicant was in possession of the antigenic compositions encompassed by the claims at the time of filing.

Art Unit: 1645

To address Applicant's comment's regarding product-by-process claims, MPEP at section 2113 states:

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (Claim was directed to a novolac color developer. The process of making the developer was allowed. The difference between the inventive process and the prior art was the addition of metal oxide and carboxylic acid as separate ingredients instead of adding the more expensive pre-reacted metal carboxylate. The product-by-process claim was rejected because the end product, in both the prior art and the allowed process, ends up containing metal carboxylate. The fact that the metal carboxylate is not directly added, but is instead produced in-situ does not change the end product.). >The structure implied by the process steps should be considered when assessing the patentability of product-by-process claims over the prior art, especially where the product can only be defined by the process steps by which the product is made, or where the manufacturing process steps would be expected to impart distinctive structural characteristics to the final product. See, e.g., In re Garnero, 412 F.2d 276, 279, 162 USPQ 221, 223 (CCPA 1979) (holding "interbonded by interfusion" to limit structure of the claimed composite and noting that terms such as "welded," "intermixed," "ground in place," "press fitted," and "etched" are capable of construction as structural limitations.)<

Based on the teachings of the MPEP, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In view of all of the above, this rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1645

5. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is maintained for claims 63-65 and 67-80 for the reasons set forth on page 9, paragraph 6 of the previous Office Action.

The rejection was on the grounds that Claims 63-65 and 67-80 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear as to what is contained in the antigenic compositions. What is contained in the fungal or yeast supernatants? Clarification and/or correction is required.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant urges that in view of the above arguments as outline under the written description rejection, one would what is contained in a fungal or yeast supernatant.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 25, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has not disclosed what components are contained in a fungal or yeast supernatant. Applicant has not defined "antigenic material". For these reasons this rejection is maintained.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 63-65 and 67-96 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 63 recites "characterized by a reduction of antigenic activity similar to a control sample and at most by 20% as measured by ELISA...". It is unclear as to what Applicant is referring. Clarification and/or correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 63-72, 77-79, 81-89 and 94-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Shantha (*Natural Toxins, Volume 7, Issue 5, p. 175-178*)(Abstract only).

Claims 63-72, 77-79, 81-89 and 94-95 are drawn to an antigenic composition comprising a fungal cell culture supernatant of *Cladosporium* comprising aflatoxin shed into the supernatant during culturing said fungal cell culture.

Shantha teaches a composition comprises a *Cladosporium culture* comprising aflatoxin B1 (see the Abstract). The products of the prior art reference appear to be the same or an obvious or analogous variant of the product claimed by the applicant because they appear to possess the same or similar functional characteristics. The purification or production of a product by a particular process does not impart novelty or unobviousness to a product when the same product is taught by the prior art. This is particularly true when properties of the product are not changed by the process in an unexpected manner. See In re Thorpe, 227 USPO 964 (CAFC 1985); In re Marosi, 218 USPO 289, 29222-293 (CAFC 1983); In re Brown, 173 USPO 685 (CCPA 1972). Even if applicant's product can be shown to be of higher purity than the product of the prior art reference, applicant's needs to show some unexpected and unique utility or property, such as unexpected biologically significant increase in specific activity with which the increased purity, greater stability and/or practicality or freedom from some restrictive element or adverse side effects inherent in the product preparations of the prior art or some other secondary consideration which the additional degree of purity imparts (to which there is a basis in the specification) to applicant's product in order to overcome the aspect of the product's purity is relied upon. Shantha anticipates the claimed invention.

Since the Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing applicant's composition with the composition of the prior art, the burden is on the applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed product and the product of the prior art (i.e., that the composition of the prior art does not possess the

Art Unit: 1645

same material structural and functional characteristics of the claimed composition). See In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and In re Fitzgerald et al., 205 USPQ 594.


Conclusion

8. Any inquiry of the general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Office Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for the Group 1600 is (571) 272-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Vanessa L. Ford, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0857. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-0864.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov./>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Vanessa L. Ford
Biotechnology Patent Examiner
December 11, 2006


NITA MINFIELD
PRIMARY EXAMINER